

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION – DETROIT

In the matter of
THE CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN

CHAPTER 9 CHAPTER 9
Case No. 13 53846 swr
HONORABLE STEVEN RHODES

SECOND CORRECTED

Objections to the proposed Disclosure Statement

AS STATED BEFORE - -

Sadly absent from the chapter 9 debtor's disclosure is an acknowledgement of state of the city as it exists, not as a business entity, but as a living breathing organism or more appropriately as the place where perhaps a million living breathing human organisms spend their days and nights.

Some go home. Some stay.

The chapter 9 debtor is asked to acknowledge, by including in its disclosure statement, the following:

- That gang crime is rampant.
- That gangs run the city.
- That the city cannot fathom how to deal with the gangs.

- That gang turf warfare is a constant.
- That gang turf warfare costs lives.
- That gang turf warfare has no regard for bystanders.

- That neither the private gilbert police force, nor the city state county or federal law enforcement entities posted in the city have figured out how to deal with the gangs.
- That the real city of Detroit belongs to the gangs.
- That any plan that does not address the gangs and bring the gangs into the plan is a plan set up to fail.

- That the types of negotiations which must be occurring are negotiations with those in gang power.
- That only working with gangs can achieve a result gangs will respect.
- That gangs will continue to function.
- That the new city in economic alliances with gangs gives the new city a chance to survive.
- That the city must recognize the power of the gangs, their existence, the weight of their financial pull.
- That the city must recognize that particularly in the management of abandoned properties gangs rule and that the only way to effectively assist property owners who themselves are powerless to effectively use landlord tenant law / trespass law / home invasion law against proficient savvy (self-imposed “improvements” subcontractors) squatters is by teaming up with the squatters and the property owners with the goal to fairly and constitutionally protect the property owners’ property rights and at the same time find positive productive tasks for the seemingly brilliant and talented successfully scofflawing successfully squatting squatters.

ADDITIONALLY the drafters of the disclosure statement are urged to address the following:

- Will the city ever make downtown parking-friendly so that anyone who wants to spend money downtown can do so without fear of huge parking fines?
- Does the city have in place a method for drawing people to Detroit for reasons other than sports or entertainment?
- Will DDA and council (common council / city council), in their plans for mowing down the current city and putting up sports complexes and the like, be more forthright in their invitations to their “open meeting(s)” by putting up more than one 8X10 poster in microscopic print on one post in one location downtown?
- Will the city continue to keep its various departments from efficiently communicating with one another so as to continue to make a five minute question take five hours to get answered as it now does?

- What plans does the chapter 9 debtor have for phasing out its current work force and replacing it with a less expensive workforce? How will the chapter 9 debtor enforce the old chestnut "A day's pay for a day's work?" Will it take eons, decades, years, months, days or minutes to relieve itself of a non-working worker when the city decides to so relieve itself of a non-working worker? Will attendance for eight hours at any work post or work site (especially if tools and equipment are left there) be equivalent to eight hours work or must a demonstrable work product exists? Will workers have supervisors in contact with them monitoring their work all day every day or will supervisors be days away and at remote locations requiring time and transportation to monitor emerging work concerns?
- What are the precise plans for city owned land? What if a foreign investor, one foreign investor, offers to buy as a package all of the parcels of city owned land in one purchase??
- What provisions has the chapter 9 debtor made for influx of massive amounts of foreign interest money both from individuals, organizations, and governments themselves or leaders of government with funds at their disposal? What safeguards are in place to deal with security concerns arising along with such possible deals?
- How can the chapter 9 debtor rationalize the real expense in manpower necessary to respond to the state's skewed methods of calculating and re calculating revenue sharing requirements?
- Why should the chapter 9 debtor respond to such requests? Can the chapter 9 debtor challenge the state either here in an adversary proceeding or in district court in a separate suit?
- I want the city to disclose if it knows why the state has made it more and more difficult for the city to share revenue by structuring new requirements not consistent with size of population but rather with degree of recordkeeping and analytical manipulation of new data categories which such record keeping and analysis appears to require Harvard PhD grads in think tanks to analyze and group results in a form minimally acceptable to the state.
- What does the chapter 9 debtor intend to do about the state's apparently ever increasing need to keep funds out of Detroit?
- Will the city's various fiefdom chiefs allow coordination such that an inspector and ticket writer for plumbing for example may coordinate with one for signage and one for lighting and one for electrical and one for health and so on or must the city constantly get in the way (by convoluted and non-coordinated micromanaged inspection categories) of people trying to open businesses and do business in the city?

FINALLY --

The most recent submission by the chapter 9 debtor is infinitely more readable in form and in content. Its brevity too is to be commended. Yet the proposed disclosure statement still lacks transparency in certain areas.

- Although 'SYNCORA' is described in the disclosure statement it is still unclear how its existence as both (a) the keeper of the gate at the Detroit Windsor Tunnel and (b) the determiner of casino limbo fund use will affect the new city as the new city emerges from the chapter 9. Nor is there an understandable breakdown of the book entries of the two syncora existences? Finally it is not clear whether there are more heads to the syncora and if so when such heads will make themselves visible.
- The same sort of concerns still exist for COP. It was initially suggested that a more thorough definitional section might give depth and breadth to Syncora and COP. The description of their workings supported by actual and proposed entries in accounts might shed light.
- Choses of action (for injuries as yet undiscovered) still need to be addressed. It is one thing to lump together known claims but yet quite another to dismiss entirely physical ailments that have not yet made themselves known. We are after all an industrial town with huge deposits of known and unknown substances not once mentioned in any of the chapter 9 proposals.

STILL STEAMING HOT POTATO - - What is current status of federal challenge to Detroit's water supply? What is the current status of the water supply itself? What's being done while the courts are in a holding pattern? How will the matter be effectively handled during the remainder of the chapter 9? Why is there no description of same laid out as a chart showing what could happen and what might result, listing all possibilities showing all eventualities?

Why is the water "issue" looked at strictly from the aspect of bonds/return on investments/claimants and barely discussed in terms of its (pending) public health concerns?

Dated: 4/7/2014

CHARLES BRUCE IDELSOHN
By: /s/Charles Bruce Idelsohn
Charles Bruce Idelsohn (P36799)
P.O. BOX 856
Detroit, MI 48231
(586) 450-0128
charlesidelsohnattorney@yahoo.com